

EXHIBIT 1

Vinson&Elkins

Avelyn M. Ross aross@velaw.com
Tel 512 542 8411 Fax 512 236 3218

June 1, 2005

Via Facsimile No. 312.861.2200

Meredith Zinanni
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
200 E. Randolph St.
Chicago, IL 60601

Re: *Guardian Industries Corp. v. Dell Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 05-27-SLR, in the United States District Court of the District of Delaware

Dear Ms. Zinanni,

As you may know, Dell is working to formulate a counter proposal to Guardian's proposed scheduling order and protective order. In preparation for this and any following "meet and confer," it would be helpful for you to provide Dell with a clearer understanding of the alleged infringing products. Guardian's complaint broadly alleges that Dell has engaged in infringing activities related to "LCDs and related products," yet this description leaves Dell with little understanding regarding which of its products containing LCDs are accused. Any insight you can provide regarding the particular products alleged to infringe the Guardian patents would be greatly appreciated.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding this or other related matters.

With best regards,



Avelyn Marie Ross

1817:5588

573935_1.DOC

EXHIBIT 2

53rd at Third
885 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022-4834
Tel: (212) 806-1200 Fax: (212) 751-4864
www.lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

May 31, 2005

VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL

FIRM / AFFILIATE OFFICES

Boston	New York
Brussels	Northern Virginia
Chicago	Orange County
Frankfurt	Paris
Hamburg	San Diego
Hong Kong	San Francisco
London	Shanghai
Los Angeles	Silicon Valley
Milan	Singapore
Moscow	Tokyo
New Jersey	Washington, D.C.

Bryan S. Hales, Esq.
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
200 East Randolph Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Re: Guardian Industries Corp. v. Dell, Inc. et al., C.A. No.: 05-27-SLR

Dear Bryan:

We are counsel for Gateway, Inc. in this case. As you know, Gateway does not manufacture any of the LCD products accused of infringement in this case. Rather, Gateway purchases LCD products, including from companies that already have licensed the patents-in-suit or are co-defendants in this case, which Gateway then resells. Accordingly, we reiterate our prior request, consistent with the practice of the Court, that Guardian Industries stay its claims against Gateway while it pursues its case against the LCD manufacturers -- who are the parties responsible for any liability. *See, e.g., Commissariat A L'Energie Atomique v. Dell Computer Corp.*, 2004 WL 1554382 (D. Del. May 13, 2004); *Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Audiovox Comm. Corp.*, Civil Action Nos 04-1337-KAJ, -1338-KAJ, slip. op. (D. Del. May 18, 2005).

If Guardian Industries is unwilling to stay its claims against Gateway, we request that Guardian Industries identify the specific Gateway products accused of infringement in this case. Guardian Industries' vague allegation of infringement in the Complaint and First Amended Complaint -- "[o]n information and belief, Defendants each sell LCD product(s) that include a version of Fuji Wide View (WV) film" -- fails to identify the Gateway products accused of infringement. This is especially the case given that Gateway does not manufacture any of the allegedly infringing products.

Very truly yours,


Kurt M. Rogers

Cc: Richard L. Horwitz

EXHIBIT 3

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 ASHBY & GEDDES
4 BY: STEVEN J. BALICK, ESQ.

5 and

6 MORRIS NICHOLS ARSHT & TUNNELL
7 BY: THOMAS C. GRIMM, ESQ.,

8 and

9 ROBINS KAPLAN MILLER & CIRESI, L.L.P.
10 BY: MARTIN R. LUECK, ESQ.,
11 MATTHEW L. WOODS, ESQ., and
12 STACIE E. OBERTS, ESQ.
13 (Minneapolis, Minnesota)

14 and

15 HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL
16 BY: J. DAVID BRAFMAN, ESQ.

17 Counsel on behalf of Honeywell
18 International, Inc., and Honeywell
19 Intellectual Properties, Inc.

20 COHEN SEGLIAS PALLAS GREENHALL & FURMAN, P.C.
21 BY: ROBERT K. BESTE, JR., ESQ.

22 and

23 HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP
24 BY: ROBERT J. BENSON, ESQ.
25 (Los Angeles, California)

26 Counsel for Seiko Epson Corp.,
27 Kyocera Wireless Corp.

28

29

30

31

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2

3 YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR
BY: JOHN W. SHAW, ESQ.

4

5 Counsel for Olympus Corporation,
Olympus America, Inc., Sony Corporation,
and Sony Corporation of America

6

And

7

8 KENYON & KENYON
BY: ROBERT L. HAILS, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

9

10 Counsel for Sony Corporation, and Sony
Corporation of America

11 And

12

13 KENYON & KENYON
BY: GEORGE E. BADENOCH, ESQ., and
RICHARD M. ROSATI, ESQ.
(New York, New York)

14

15 Counsel for Olympus Corporation, and
Olympus America, Inc.

16

17 RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER
BY: WILLIAM J. WADE, ESQ.

18 and

19

20 WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES
BY: STEPHEN J. RIZZI, ESQ.
(New York, New York)

21

22 Counsel for Matsushita Electrical
Industrial Co. and Matsushita
Electrical Corporation of America

23

24 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ
BY: ARTHUR C. CONNOLLY, III, ESQ.

25

Counsel for Navman NZ Limited and Navman
U.S.A., Inc.

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2

3 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
4 BY: WILLIAM J. MARSDEN, JR., ESQ.

5 Counsel for Nokia, Inc., Casio, Inc., Casio
Computer and Apple Computer Inc.

6 and

7

8 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
9 BY: JOHN T. JOHNSON, ESQ.
(New York, New York)

10 Counsel for Casio, Inc., Casio Computer

11 and

12 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
13 BY: KELLY C. HUNSAKER, ESQ.
(Redwood City, California)

14 Counsel for Apple Computer Inc.

15 and

16 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
17 BY: LAUREN A. DEGNAN, ESQ., and
ANDREW R. KOPSIDAS, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

18 Counsel for Nokia, Inc.

19

20 RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER
21 BY: FREDERICK L. COTTRELL, III, ESQ., and
CHAD M. SHANDLER, ESQ.

22 and

23 HARRIS BEACH, LLP
24 BY: NEAL L. SLIFKIN, ESQ., and
PAUL J. YESAWICH, III, ESQ.
(Pittsford, New York)

25 Counsel for Eastman Kodak

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2

3 CROSS & SIMON
4 BY: AMY ELIZABETH EVANS, ESQ.

5 and

6

7 SACHNOFF & WEAVER
8 BY: BRIAN D. ROCHE, ESQ.
(Chicago, Illinois)

9

10 Counsel for Argus a/k/a Hartford
11 Computer Group, Inc.

12

13 POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON, LLP
14 BY: RICHARD L. HORWITZ, ESQ., and
15 DAVID E. MOORE, ESQ.

16

17 Counsel for Concord Cameras, Dell, Inc.,
18 Fujitsu Limited, Fujitsu America, Inc.,
19 Fujitsu Computer Products of America, Inc.,
20 Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba America, Inc.,
21 Wintek Electro-Optics Corporation, Sanyo
22 Electric Co. Ltd. and Sanyo North America,
23 Philips Electronics North America Corp.,
24 and Samsung SDI

25

and

17 FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
18 BY: BARRY W. GRAHAM, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

19

Counsel for Nikon Corporation, Nikon Inc.

20

and

21

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
BY: TIMOTHY J. VEZEAU, ESQ.
(Chicago, Illinois)

22

Counsel for Sanyo Electric Co. Ltd.
and Sanyo North America

23

and

24

and

25

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2
3 OBLON SPIVAK McCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
BY: ARTHUR I. NEUSTADT, ESQ., and
CARL E. SCHLIER, ESQ.
(Alexandria, Virginia)

5 Counsel for Toshiba America

6 and

7 VINSON & ELKINS
BY: RODERICK B. WILLIAMS, ESQ.
(Austin, Texas)

9 Counsel for Dell, Inc.

10 and

11 MILBANK TWEK HADLEY & McCLOY, LLP
BY: CHRISTOPHER E. CHALSEN, ESQ., and
CHRISTOPHER J. GASPAR, ESQ.
(New York, New York)

13 Counsel for Fujitsu Limited, Fujitsu
14 America, Inc., Fujitsu Computer Products
of America, Inc.

15 and

16 FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
17 BY: ELIZABETH NIEMEYER, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

18 Counsel for Wintek Electro-Optics
19 Corporation

20 and

21 HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP
22 BY: NELSON M. KEE, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

23 Counsel for Philips Electronics
24 North America Corp.

25 and

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2

3 PAUL HASTINGS JANOFSKY & WALKER, LLP
4 BY: ELIZABETH L. BRANN, ESQ.
(San Diego, California)

5 Counsel for Samsung SDI

6

7 POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON, LLP
BY: PHILIP A. ROVNER, ESQ.

8 and

9 STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
10 BY: MATTHEW W. SIEGAL, ESQ.
(New York, New York)

11 Counsel for Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd.
and Fuji Photo Film U.S.A., Inc.

12

13 DUANE MORRIS
14 BY: JOHN L. REED, ESQ., and
MATT NEIDERMAN, ESQ.

15 and

16 DUANE MORRIS
17 BY: L. LAWTON ROGERS, III, ESQ., and
D. JOSEPH ENGLISH, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

18

19 Counsel for Audiovox Communications Corp.

20

21 YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR
BY: ADAM WYATT POFF, ESQ.

22 and

23 GREENBLUM and BERNSTEIN, PLC
24 BY: MICHAEL J. FINK, ESQ.
(Reston, Virginia)

25

Counsel for Pentax Corporation,
Pentax U.S.A., inc.

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2

3 BOUCHARD MARGULES & FRIEDLANDER
BY: DOMINICK T. GATTUSO, ESQ.

4

and

5

6 OBLON SPIVAK McCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
BY: RICHARD D. KELLY, ESQ.
(Alexandria, Virginia)

7

Counsel for Optrex America, Inc.

8

9

10 McCARTER & ENGLISH
BY: PAUL A. BRADLEY, ESQ.

11

Counsel on behalf of Optrex America

12

13 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ
BY: N. RICHARD POWERS, ESQ.

14

15 Counsel on behalf of Sony Ericsson AB
and Sony Ericsson, Inc.

16

17 BAKER & MCKENZIE
BY: KEVIN M. O'BRIEN, ESQ.
(Washington, District of Columbia)

18

Counsel on behalf of Curitel Ltd.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Brian P. Gaffigan
Registered Merit Reporter

1 I wasn't all together sure what was meant by that but
2 putting the best spin on it, I would take it to mean that,
3 well, you know, we saw the Court struggle there with "who
4 ought to be first," suppliers or manufacturers and so we
5 thought we would deal with it by not naming any of the
6 manufacturers here. Maybe I got you wrong on that but that
7 is sort of how I understood it.

8 But while I appreciate the effort, it doesn't
9 solve the problem for me because what I think was
10 predictable has happened, and that is the people who have a
11 real stake in terms of keeping their customers happy are the
12 manufacturers and suppliers, and they have been subject no
13 doubt to a whole lot of communication from their customers,
14 including demands for indemnification and third-party
15 complaints and probably less formal demands and requests.

16 So I feel like I do have a circumstance that
17 is very akin to the CEA case, whether they brought the
18 suppliers in in the first instance or not. And that is why
19 I'm going to structure this case in roughly the same way.
20 Now, I say "roughly" because, you know, no two cases are
21 exactly alike, particularly when you have two cases which
22 are orchestrated on an operatic scale like these two are
23 with dozens and dozens of defendants, literally.

24 So I'm sure there are things, Mr. Lueck, in your
25 case that are not going to be like CEA's case, and so I

1 don't want you to be concerned that everything that happens
2 there, you are going to be in the same mold, because there
3 may be sound reasons to do things somewhat differently.

4 But I don't think there is a sound reason to
5 depart from the traditional rule which is in many cases and
6 has reached a point of being memorialized in the manual on
7 complex litigation that says you ought to give the people
8 who are making the accused device face the music, and let
9 them face it in the first instance, particularly in a case
10 like this where there is not something else going on where
11 these people are infringing. They're taking something that
12 you say infringes and they're putting it into the stuff they
13 sell. And so settling whether those components infringe,
14 if we got all the manufacturers in, would settle the thing
15 entirely. If we don't get them all in, we will have
16 substantially reduced the universe of litigation that has to
17 go forward against the -- and I will use the term "end
18 product manufacturers" for ease of reference, with all due
19 respect to the folks from Nikon. It's just likely to make
20 things more manageable in a way that is consistent with the
21 fair administration of justice.

22 So I'm going to grant some type of stay to the
23 end product manufacturers but the contours of that are
24 something that I'm open to discuss within bounds of reason.
25 In short, I think you made a persuasive case for needing to